

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

In re DOUGLAS J. CRAWFORD,

on Contempt.

2d Civil No. B270705
(Arising out of 2d Civil No. B257412)

THE COURT:

These contempt proceedings arise from a petition for rehearing filed by attorney Douglas J. Crawford. On March 8, 2016, we issued an order to show cause why Crawford should not be adjudged guilty of two counts of contempt and punished for (1) impugning the integrity of this court, and (2) falsely stating under penalty of perjury that the justices of this court accepted a bribe. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1209 et seq.)

We find Crawford guilty of one count of direct contempt. We fine him \$1,000. We refer Crawford to the State Bar for investigation and, if appropriate, the imposition of disciplinary sanctions. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6086.7.)

FACTS

Crawford represented himself in an action against JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (Chase). Prior to a deposition in the case, Crawford threatened opposing counsel with pepper spray and a stun gun. Chase moved for terminating sanctions. Crawford filed an opposition that was openly contemptuous of the trial court. The trial court

granted Chase's motion for terminating sanctions. Crawford appealed. We affirmed. (*Crawford v. JPMorgan Chase, N.A.* (2015) 242 Cal.App.4th 1265.)

Crawford filed a verified petition for rehearing. The statements quoted below are from that petition:

Count I: Impugning the Integrity of the Court

1. "Purposefully misspelling the name of a deceased individual, who was the victim of a crime shortly before her death, is truly appalling, disgusting and shocks one's consciousness especially taking into consideration the Court's opening footnote, but the Grandads of Anarchy did not stop their defiling, despicable conduct there." (Petr., p. 3.)

2. "In its ridiculous, Chase-driven opinion, the Grandads of Anarchy state on page 2: 'Chase rescinded the annuity, but Crawford complains that Chase failed to reimburse him \$2000 in lost interest.' In any other situation, the Court factual inaccuracies would be laughable, but given their purposefully misstating of the facts and bastardizing California law, it is further evidence of their endless corruption, bias and senility." (Petr., pp. 3-4.)

3. "The Grandads of Anarchy current bastard version of the actual facts fully demonstrate just how far they are up Chase's bum and helps to explain the origin of their fecal stained opinion." (Petr., p. 5.)

4. "More importantly, and glaringly absent from these feeble-minded, nincompoops colored opinion is the undisputed fact that Petitioner served numerous Deposition Subpoenas, on all the same deponents, Kohli, Davis, Chase & Griffin, demanding that they appear for their deposition at an entirely different location (Ventura Majestic Theater, 26 S. Chestnut Ave, Ventura) that would allow for them to bring security to waylay their feigned concerns." (Petr., p. 6.)

5. "Senility, selective Chase-favored memory and corruption are persistent traits of these Grandads of Anarchy making it difficult to determine which one is in play at any given time." (Petr., p. 6.)

6. "Disgustingly, these Grandads of Anarchy write in their Chase-slanted opinion: 'Crawford's petition referenced the Oklahoma City and Boston bombings.' The Court's factually unsupported statement truly crystalizes their myopic position because the Boston bombings had not even occurred yet when Petitioner wrote the allegedly prophetic, recited passage!" (Petrn., pp. 6-7.)

7. "Desperate to appease their master, these corrupt, pathetic, low-life scum of human refuse stoop to an all-time low by actually fabricating disparaging facts off the dismembered bodies of completely unrelated individuals to further Chase's position. Possibly, if GOA Gilbert and his senile brethren actually spent more time reading the briefs of the appealing parties and California precedent rather than opining on his egocentric blog of the inane, all or some of the aforementioned errors would not even happen?" (Petrn., p. 7.)

8. "As Petitioner clearly stated in his Reply Brief, Petitioner would not have appealed the Superior Court's ruling if he had known the Second Appellate District, Division Six only had three crusty, old corrupt codgers for adjudicators whose only present benefit is a resounding argument for the institution of a mandatory retirement age for Justices of the Appellate Divisions. Bullying, elder abuse and judicial corruption all share a commonality of an ability to continue unabated because no one possesses the fortitude or courage to speak up and do something about it." (Petrn., p. 8.)

9. "Akin to Chase's lap dog in Superior Court, Vincent O'Neill, these Grandads of Anarchy digest the waste expelled by their golden goose, Walter J.R. Traver ('Traver'), blindly and without question completely ignoring the truth - Petitioner never pointed pepper spray or a stun gun at Walter J.R. Traver." (Petrn., p. 8.)

10. "What this fecal-stained Court also fails to mention is" (Petrn., p. 9.)

11. "What these disgusting old, white corrupt Justices fail to care one iota about is the helpless deposition reporter named Gina M. Currie that would have been the one killed by 'John Doe's' bullet. In a room with three attorneys (Davis,

Traver & Petitioner), one elder abusing criminal (Kohli) and a cancer survivor, the beautiful and effervescent deposition reporter, Gina M. Currie, any inadvertently discharged bullet would have hit Ms. Currie." (Petr., p. 10.)

12. "Please explain, GOA Gilbert, Yegan and Perren, when did the Court abandoned the legal concept of stare decisis and how can that be reconciled with this decision based on *Del Junco v. Hufnagel*? Do certain California cases simply not apply to J.P. Morgan Chase and their confederates?" (Petr., p. 12.)

13. "Chase puppets and Grandads of Anarchy Gilbert, Yegan and Perren do not even have the mental capacity or human decency to take the time or care necessary to spell the decedent and victim of Chase's financial elder abuse name correctly ('N-I-N-O-N,' pronounced 'knee - non'), let alone record her correct age in which she passed or accurately or without bias or prejudice recite the underlying facts of the present case correctly because they simply cannot be bothered with such trivial matters when any appeal involves a lowly self-represented litigant. According to the 'substance' of this stench-laden opinion, Petitioner is only entitled to nigger justice." (Petr., p. 16 [fn. omitted].)

14. "Truth be told, one Justice Yegan or Perren, as clearly evidenced at oral argument, does not even know what year it is or what day of the week and Gilbert is covering for him out of a sense of loyalty." (Petr., p. 16, fn. 2.)

15. "How or why would anyone ever possibly seek refuge or relief from these corrupt, senile and morally bankrupt individuals, who callously invoke the horrific Boston Marathon bombing tragedy to factually support their legally unsubstantiated position all to appease their Corporate overlord? The proof of such a frivolous contention is this indigestible shit pudding defecated by GOA's Gilbert, Yegan and Perren masquerading as a legal analysis." (Petr., pp. 16-17.)

16. "Intentional or not (intentional), this reviewing Court fails to understand or comprehend the legal distinction between the words 'sanction,' 'contempt' and 'forfeiture,' as they apply to Petitioner's institution of several Small Claims actions against multiple deponents for their non-appearance pursuant to CCP § 1992.

Their careless, interchangeable use of these legally distinct words, combined with their lack of understanding their distinction definitions, results in a complete mockery of statutory interpretation, legal analysis and legislative intent behind the enactment of CCP § 1992, Small Claims Court and the institution of contempt proceedings, all for the benefit of their master, J. P. Morgan Chase." (Petn., p. 17.)

17. "Additionally, statute of limitations for the institution of 'contempt' proceedings for failure to comply with a Deposition Subpoena is strictly limited to the time in which the Court can order compliance, as set forth by CCP § 1209, or effectively, until the unlimited civil case has ended. The foregoing is called 'legal analysis,' something completely foreign to these feeble minded Chase cohorts." (Petn., p. 19.)

18. "Kohli, Davis, Griffin and Chase have, literally, given the Court the one finger salute by failing to attend their noticed depositions and, because of this Reviewing Court's perverted bias, prejudice and unquestionable alliance to them, this corrupt tribunal thanks them for their middle finger acknowledgment. What is more obvious, distressing and disgusting is the undisputable fact that if the roles were reversed and it was Chase that had filed a CCP § 1992 action against Petitioner, the result would be entirely different without discussion." (Petn., p. 21.)

19. "These senile GOA's state in the present case: 'Acuna stands for nothing more than a different department of the superior court has no jurisdiction over a case original brought in small claims court'. The plain language of Acuna v. Gunderson Chevrolet, Inc (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 1467 could not be farther away from the Court's contention, as well as the Court analysis of the same proposition." (Petn., p. 23.)

20. "In short, Petitioner readily acknowledges that this Appellate Court has the ability to do whatever it wants regardless of statutory law, stare decisis and legal logic in its concerted effort to satiate its Puppet Master, J. P. Morgan Chase,

despite the contempt and derision for the law that these adjudicators breed. In that vein, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to instruct the lower Court and Small Claims Court on how to dispose of the currently pending Small Claims actions." (Petrn., p. 26.)

21. "This is a case of political retribution of Biblical proportions. Judge O'Neill took great offense when Petitioner ran against Judge O'Neill's former BFF, Superior Court Judge Ronald S. Prager, who O'Neill and Prager established their life-long friendship from their time together at the California Attorney General's Office. Corrupt O'Neill took umbrage when Petitioner called Judge Ronald S. Prager 'the most corrupt judge in San Diego County' based on Prager's outlandish ruling in the San Diego Convention Center reverse tax expansion project. [¶] In a truly, modern day, twisted and demented Cain and Abel plot of retaliation concocted by Traver and O'Neill, O'Neill literally Ordered Petitioner and his little brother to appear in the direct line of fire from an attorney, Walter J.R. Traver, who had a well-documented history of mental instability, unprofessional conduct, sadistic behavior and a propensity for resolving disputes through the use of a firearm. Attachment 1. Had this Court bothered to do a peppercorn more than its current form of nigger justice, the Court would have found the Court transcripts replete with inappropriate, prejudicial and hateful comments by Chase's lap dog O'Neill directed towards Petitioner and irrational behavior from Traver. [¶] When viewed in the light of day, only a child has the courage to truthfully describe the present spectacle of three shrived-up old men prancing around on their Chase high-horse completely devoid of any article of covering. Whether our government is described as an oligopoly or capitalistically based, the result of corporate governance is the same." (Petrn., p. 27.)

22. "When individuals have to lie, cheat, threat, fabricate and distort the truth to win, as herein, it is a vacuous victory and truly the highest compliment. The cost, however, is that these three corrupt politicians *spawn anarchy* to the populace with their genuine lack of respect for the law specifically, and flaccid

respect for humanity, in general, and to those Grandads of Anarchy, I, Douglas J. Crawford *Respectfully* submit[.]" (Petr., pp. 28-29.)

Count 2: Falsely Stating the Appellate Justices Accepted a Bribe

1. "This Court's opinion, fraught with Chase-colored errors, fully demonstrates the marriage of senility and judicial corruption[.] As plainly stated in Petitioner Douglas J. Crawford's ('Petitioner') Reply Brief, Petitioner never had any faith that the three senior 'retired' (*in*)Justices would ever perform their job in accordance the laws of the State of California, but, rather, Petitioner knew that these senile adjudicators would do whatever Respondent J.P. Morgan Chase Bank et. al. told them to do. However, these corrupt, *Grandads of Anarchy*, Gilbert, Yegan and Perren, have stooped to a new, all time low with their blatant Chase-colored errors of fact and law that demonstrate their truly beautiful marriage of senility with corruption by their tentatively 'published' Corporate-driven opinion. (Petr., p. 2 [fn. omitted].)

2. "Grandads of Anarchy, Gilbert, Yegan and Perren, are only going to temporarily 'publish' this opinion and after they erroneously believe that it has caused enough pubic fervor, the opinion will no longer be certified for publication, per Chase playbook." (Petr., p. 2, fn. 1.)

3. "The errors contained within the Courts opinion are so obvious, vast and plentiful one has to laugh and wonder out loud just how much the Grandads of Anarchy were bribed by J.P. Morgan Chase to crap out the current abomination disguised fecal legal matter. " (Petr., p. 2.)

4. ". . . The only question left outstanding is "*how much*", dear, old Grandads of Anarchy, did Chase pay you to write this fiction-based fecal opinion?" (Petr., p. 12.)

5. "Our society has progressed little . . . from the company-owned coal towns of old where the serfs lived in company-owned shacks, worked at company-owned mines, shopped at the company stores, were paid in company script and disputes were presided over by company beholden cronies. Only the

names have changed because our homes are financed by J.P. Morgan Chase Bank loans, our clothes and sustenance are bought with J.P. Morgan Chase credit along with our vehicles, boats, jet skis and we are actually paid in Chase script with the unfortunate consequence that our dispute resolution system being governed by corrupt politicians beholden to J.P. Morgan Chase, as present herein." (Petn., p. 28, fn. omitted.)

6. "Petitioner takes it all as the highest compliment. This case was never going to a trial because it would have put J.P. Morgan Chase out of business and to ensure that would never happen, Traver threatened Petitioner, in writing, and when that wouldn't work, Traver hired an unknown gunman to point a loaded firearm at Petitioner and when that wouldn't work, Traver committed perjury and bribed various Superior Court judges to rule in his favor and finally, Traver and company bribed these three corrupt politicians to ignore all current California law, manipulate the facts and go so far as to actually fabricated facts off the deaths and horrific injuries of the victims of the Boston Marathon bombings. All that effort to cheat Petitioner Douglas J. Crawford out of a pittance sum of Chase script is an indirect compliment to Petitioner." (Petn., p. 28.)

We denied the petition for rehearing. Crawford petitioned our Supreme Court for review. The Supreme Court denied the petition for review on February 24, 2016. We delayed issuing the instant order to show cause while Crawford's petition for review was pending so as to avoid interfering with the review process.

DISCUSSION

A direct contempt "is committed in the immediate view and presence of the court, or of the judge at chambers" (Code Civ. Proc. § 1211, subd. (a).) An attorney commits a direct contempt when he impugns the integrity of the court in a document filed with the court. (*In re Koven* (2005) 134 Cal.App.4th 262, 271.) An act of contempt is punishable by fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding five days, or both. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1218, subd. (a).) "The judge of a court is well within his rights in protecting his own reputation from groundless attacks upon his judicial integrity and it

is his bounden duty to protect the integrity of his court.' [Citation.] 'However willing he may be to forego the private injury, the obligation is upon him by his oath to maintain the respect due to the court over which he presides.'" (*In re Ciraolo* (1969) 70 Cal.2d 389, 394-395.)

Here Crawford's petition for rehearing is contemptuous on its face. The petition refers to the justices of the court as the "Grandads of Anarchy." It calls the justices "senile" and "corrupt, pathetic, low-life scum of human refuse." These are just a few of the contemptuous remarks throughout the petition. In addition to these contemptuous remarks, the petition accuses this court of a crime: accepting a bribe. (See Pen. Code, § 68.) This accusation made under penalty of perjury is false and subject to criminal prosecution. We express no opinion whether the appropriate prosecuting agency should take such action.

Crawford's answer to our order to show cause contains an apology. The apology is insufficient to purge Crawford of contempt: Crawford is an experienced attorney; the charges are false, lacking any support whatsoever; the tone of the petition for rehearing is spiteful and malicious; Crawford's statements were not made in the heat of a courtroom battle, but were deliberately made in a petition for rehearing; and Crawford also impugned the integrity of the trial court in his motion to disqualify the trial judge. (See *In re Koven*, *supra*, 134 Cal.App.4th at pp. 274-275.)

We also take into consideration his statement: "I am currently undergoing intensive treatment for various underlying issues that are clearly evident in the Petition for Rehearing and would like to continue that treatment unabated, which I submit to explain why I am not submitting my apologies to the Court personally."

Crawford argues that the contemptuous statements made in his petition for rehearing constitute a continuous course of conduct. He concludes that pursuant to Penal

Code section 654, he can be punished for only one count of contempt. We need not decide the matter. Punishment for a single count of contempt will suffice.

DISPOSITION

We find Douglas J. Crawford guilty of one count of direct criminal contempt of this court. He is ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000, payable in the clerk's office of this court within 60 days after this decision becomes final for all purposes. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.7, the clerk of this court is directed to forward to the State Bar a copy of this judgment of contempt. Upon the finality of judgment, the clerk shall issue the remittiturs in Case No. B257412.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

GILBERT, P. J.

We concur:

YEGAN, J.

PERREN, J.

Douglas J. Crawford, in pro. per., for Plaintiff and Appellant.